REMARKS

Section 112 rejection

Applicant cancels all claims that depend on cancelled independent claims 20 and 26. Applicant amends claim 7 to depend on claim 1 instead of cancelled claim 5. These amendments overcome the section 112 rejection of those claims.

Section 103(a) rejection

As best understood by Applicant, the Examiner considers the *Burns* content server 52 to correspond to the claimed "storage server" and the *Burns* independent service-provider ("ISP") 56 to correspond to the claimed "local server." In rejecting the claim under section 103(a), the Examiner appears to concede that *Burns* does not teach the claimed content manager. It is not clear to Applicant, however, in what way *Burns* suggests the claimed content manager. Since the Examiner alludes to the continuous-media server ("CMS") 74 present within each ISP 56, Applicant speculates that perhaps the Examiner considers the CMS to suggest the claimed content manager.

In FIG. 2 and its accompanying discussion, *Burns* teaches an ISP 56 in communication with several subscribers 58, 60. Associated with the ISP 56 is a CMS 74 that serves continuous data streams to the subscribers 58, 60 belonging to that ISP. *Burns* also teaches that the network can include several ISPs, with the ISP shown in FIG. 2 being a representative example.[1] This suggests that each ISP has its own separate CMS for controlling delivery of content to the subscribers of that ISP. Were this not the case, the ISPs would no longer be truly "independent" service providers.

Applicant amends independent claims 1, 33, and 49 to recite a content manager that is in communication with each of several local servers. This content manager is not associated with any one of the local servers. The content manager thus provides centralized control over the

---

[1] *Burns*, col. 6, lines 34-37 ("Many independent service providers (ISPs), as represented by ISP 56, function as terminal connections...to the network 54").

delivery of viewable data objects throughout the network. The amendment thus clearly distinguishes the claimed content manager from the continuous media server taught by *Burns*, the influence of which extends only as far as its ISP.

Summary

Now pending in this application are claims 1-4, 6, 7, 9, 11, and 33-69. Of these, claims 1, 33, and 49 are independent. These claims are now believed to be in condition for allowance.

No additional fees are believed to be due in connection with the filing of this response. However, to the extent fees are due or credits are forthcoming, please adjust our deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Nov 14, 2001

Faustino A. Lichauco
Reg. No. 41,942

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

VERSION WITH MARKINGS TO SHOW CHANGES MADE

1. (Thrice Amended) A system for providing a viewable data object to a viewer receiver, said system comprising:

a first local server, selected from a plurality of local servers, for storing a selection of viewable data objects, said first local server being in communication with said viewer receiver;

a storage server in communication with each of said local servers, said storage server configured to store a set of viewable data objects that includes said selection of viewable data objects;

a content manager in communication with said storage server and each of said local servers, said content manager being configured to automatically control access, by a viewer receiver, to a viewable data object from said selection of viewable data objects.

7. (Thrice Amended) The system of claim [~~5~~]1, wherein said content manager is adapted to control work queues for video data objects stored on said local server.

33. (Twice Amended) A network to provide viewable data objects to television viewers interactively, the network comprising:

a plurality of local servers to store viewable data objects, each local server being configured to transmit particular viewable data objects to a distinct and different set of televisions, each local server to transmit a particular viewable data object to one of the televisions in response to receiving a request from the one of the televisions; [~~and~~]

a storage server coupled to distribute viewable data objects to the local servers, the storage server being responsive to demands of the sets of televisions connected to each different local server and

a content manager in communication with the storage server and each of the plurality of local servers, the content manager being configured to automatically control access to viewable data objects by a television.

49. (Amended) A method for providing a viewable data object to a viewer receiver, said method comprising:

storing a selection of viewable data objects on a first local server selected from a plurality of local servers, said first local server being in communication with said viewer receiver;

storing a set of viewable data objects on a storage server in communication with each of said local servers, said set of viewable data objects including said selection of viewable data objects

automatically managing each of said local servers to control[~~ling~~] access by said viewer receiver to a viewable data object selected from said selection of viewable data objects.